

SMAA LEA Workgroup Minutes 9/3/15

Audit

A survey to determine some baseline data on the conclusions the audit reached has been sent to the workgroup. A response is requested by 5pm Friday September 5th. These results will be tabulated and shared with the group. A second survey on options to deal with the results of the survey will be prepared and sent to the group. A webinar is planned for mid-September with Bureau of State Audits staff and Senator Liu's office to discuss the findings.

One of the points raised was about the participation fee that was included in all LACOE contracts. The auditors found this was double claiming. This would mean that monies would be owed back to the federal government. The question is who is obligated for the repayment. If the LEC required this to sign the contract, are they liable? DHCS is supposed to review contracts as part of site reviews that are supposed to occur every three years of LECs/LGAs. This practice has been going on since 2010. It was noted in the Audit that DHCS plans a site review of LACOE in September.

Deferral:

All LECS and LGAs have been paid by DHCS. However, the amounts some received do not cover what is owed back to the state under the hold harmless provisions of Welfare and Institutions Code 14132.47. Attached is a list of LECs/LGAs who have not distributed their funds. However Alameda LGA reported they have not received their funds yet they are not listed. DHCS related in their call with stakeholders on August 31st that they would be sending out instructions on payment by September 5th.

The other issue raised concerned inaccurate payment amounts. DHCS has said they will be issuing instructions on this as well.

RMTS

Clarifying Question: The stakeholder group discussed the latest iteration of the process. A copy is attached. LEAs were asked to comment and suggest that coordinators should be informed when the questions are sent so they can do follow up.

Review of Moments: There was a report that moments for Q 3-4 have been reviewed but results have not been shared. LEAs are supposed to be able to review their moments. The question is if DHCS and the LECs/LGAs have done a review they should have some preliminary idea of the percentage to be applied to backcasting. Why isn't this data being shared with LEAs?

Training: PCG provided training to the LGA consortium coordinators. Others do not report training. It appears that LEC/LGAs are not providing training to participants but to coordinators. However. There has been little guidance to coordinators on training. Materials had been sent by the Workgroup by districts to use. Since these had not been approved they were not considered official training documents that could be used. A conversation with John Mendoza said private groups could distribute information but it could not be considered sanctioned. We have asked for this in writing but it has not been received.

LEA Billing Option Update: The participants in the Stakeholder group reported the following training:

September 24th from 9-11am –Part 1

1-3pm- Part 2

This will be a webinar.